

## **REMARKS**

This Response is submitted in reply to the Office Action dated August 23, 2006. The specification has been amended to include a cross-reference to a related application. Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 13, and 24-26 have been amended. No new subject matter has been added to the specification or the Claims. Applicant has enclosed a Petition for a Two Month Extension of Time to reply to the Office Action. Applicant has enclosed herewith a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account 02-1818 for any fees which are due and owing.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102**

The Office Action rejected Claims 1-17 and 19-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by US 2003/0216167 to Gauselmann ("Gauselmann"). These rejected Claims include independent Claims 1, 13, 24 and 26. Applicants respectfully disagree with such rejection at least with respect to independent Claims 1, 13 and 24 and the Claims which depend therefrom. Independent Claims 1, 13 and 24 each include a "rearranging" element. The Office Action did not analyze such element or otherwise specify Gauselmann's disclosure of such element. Based on Applicants' review, Gauselmann does not disclose such element. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of such rejection with respect to independent Claims 1, 13 and 24 and the Claims which depend therefrom.

To advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants have decided to make certain amendments to clarify the Claim language of Independent Claims 1, 13 and 24. Applicants amended dependent Claims 2, 3, 5, 6 and 25 to make the language of such Claims consistent with the language of such amended independent Claims.

Applicants have also amended independent Claim 26. Independent Claim 26, as amended, recites: "each one of the bonus outcomes being indicated, then masked and then rearranged before enabling player selection of the masked outcomes." Gauselmann does not disclose such element.

For the reasons provided above, Applicants respectfully submit that Gauselmann does not anticipate the Claims submitted with this Response.

**Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103**


The Office Action rejected dependent Claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gauselmann in view of US 6,511,375 to ("Kaminkow"). Claim 18 depends from independent Claim 13. For the reasons provided above with respect to Gauselmann and Claim 13, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 13 is patentable over the combination of Gauselmann and Kaminkow.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the Claims submitted with this Response are in condition for allowance. An earnest endeavor has been made to place this application in condition for formal allowance and is courteously solicited. If the Examiner has any questions regarding this Response, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLP

BY

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Renato L. Smith  
Reg. No. 45,117  
Customer No. 29159

Dated: January 23, 2007